DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 628 SP 002 864

By-Rosenfeld, Michael

An Evaluation of a Summer Reading Institute, 1968.

Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.
Pub Date Mar 69
Note-51p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.65
Descriptors-Elementary School Teachers, *Institutes (Training Programs), Measurement Instruments, *Program Evaluation, Reading
Identifiers-Reading Institute Survey

This document describes part of the evaluation of a six-week reading institute for 69 K-3 teachers from the Raymond School, Model School Division (MSD), Washington, D.C. and thereby provides an evaluation model for schools to use in their own inservice training programs. Two evaluation instruments developed by an MSD innovation team in cooperation with Educational Testing Service and one instrument developed by the team alone are appended. However, only one of the instruments--the Reading Institute Survey, which was designed to elicit teachers' opinions about the Institute and their perceptions of what they learned--forms the basis of this report. the results of its administration during the last week of the Institute are presented and assessed in terms of the Institute's accomplishment of 18 objectives--attitudinal, methodological, behavioral, and professional. The Survey measures changes the participant foresees in his own classroom, types of favored reading instruction, and reactions to the sensitivity training and experiences (such as working with children) of the program. Although the data was not collected scientifically, it was felt that the experience of the team (who would be available for curriculum assistance during the coming year) in specifying objectives and the data to be collected and in developing measurement instruments would be useful in later program evaluations. (LP)

EDO 30628

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

AN EVALUATION OF A SUMMER READING INSTITUTE, 1968

Prepared by

Michael Rosenfeld

The Institute which is the subject of this report was conducted by the Model School Division, District of Columbia Public Schools in cooperation with the Education Development Center, Newton, Massachusetts.

SP002864

March 1969

Educational Testing Service
Princeton, New Jersey

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD

INTRODUCTION

Background 1
ETS Involvement 2
General Design of Study 2

METHOD

Objectives 4
Potential Assessment Techniques 4
Instrument Development 4
Administration of Instruments 5

RESULTS

Reading Institute Objectives 7
Data to be used in assessing objectives 9
Reading Institute Survey 11

DISCUSSION

Reading Practices 20
Teacher Participation in Institute 21
Sensitivity Training 22
The Innovation Team 22
General Participant Reactions to Institute . . 23
Improving the Institute 24
Comments about the Evaluation 24
Recommendations 25

CONCLUSIONS 26

APPENDIXES

A Reading Institute Survey ii
B Classroom Observational Form xii
C Pre-Post Questionnaire xxi

FORWORD

The study reported here represents an attempt by ETS to aid a school system in conducting its own evaluation of an in-service training program. The report is based on a questionnaire developed jointly by the Model School Division (MSD) and Educational Testing Service.

The writer wishes to express his thanks to several people for their special contribution to this project:

Mary Lela Sherburne and the MSD Innovation Team for their assistance, cooperation, and patience during the conduct of the study.

Gerry Bogatz and Diane Joyce, ETS Research Assistants, who aided in the instrument development and data handling.

INTRODUCTION

This report is intended to describe part of an evaluation of a six-week reading institute for 69 K-3 teachers conducted in the Raymond School, Model School Division (MSD), Washington, D.C. Public Schools during the summer of 1968. The evaluation plans and data analysis contained in the report were designed to provide, as simply as possible, documentation of what the participants (teachers) felt they had learned during the Institute, as well as their overall evaluation of it. This report is also an attempt to provide an evaluation model that is feasible for a school system to implement with its own staff and resources. Because the major intent of the project (from ETS' point of view) was to assist the MSD in conducting its own evaluation of the Institute, a conscious attempt was made to place the burden of producing instruments on them. MSD representatives played a very active role in this process.

Background

The Institute was organized and directed by the Innovation Team, a group of 15 teachers released from classroom responsibilities and given a charge to assist in bringing innovation and change to the Division's 14 elementary schools. In February, 1968, the Innovation Team conducted a survey of K-3 reading practices. That survey provided the following information:

1. Many teachers had little or no training in the teaching of reading.
2. Reading practices were very traditional and not responsive to the specific needs of neighborhood children.
3. Teachers felt they needed training in new methodologies and approaches to the teaching of reading.
4. The teachers wanted assistance in acquiring the knowledge and skills necessary to improve their ability to teach reading.

Armed with these inputs, the members of the Innovation Team decided to organize a summer reading institute to provide the desired training. In addition, they planned to run the Institute differently. In the past, in-service workshops had tended to use a passive instructional style. This Institute was going to require its participants to learn by doing. The program was also designed

to have the teachers focus on the individual differences in children and plan their reading instruction accordingly. To accomplish this, the teachers were to be exposed to and gain familiarity with a wide variety of new techniques and materials. Finally, because of both the necessity and desirability of having the Innovation Team and participants work closely together, a full week of sensitivity training was planned for all participants and staff.

ETS Involvement

Educational Testing Service was asked to assist the Innovation Team in the evaluation of the Reading Institute. ETS proposed the following general activities:

1. Collaborate with MSD personnel to formalize the objectives of the Reading Institute. These objectives would define the attitudinal and behavioral changes in participants desired at the end of the Institute.
2. Develop, with the assistance of MSD personnel, an observational form to be used by MSD staff to document specified aspects of observable classroom activity.
3. Develop, jointly with MSD staff, a questionnaire to assess participants': (a) attainment of specified attitudes, and knowledge regarding reading practices, and (b) overall perception of the Institute.

General Design of Study

ETS originally proposed the following approaches to design:

1. If there were more applicants than spaces for participants, a true control group could be achieved through random selection of Institute participants and interested (but not accepted) "controls".
2. If applications were made before the end of the school year (1968), pre and post measurements could be utilized.
3. If both "A" and "B" existed, a pre-post experimental-control design would be possible.

Two major assessment techniques were also proposed:

1. Direct observation--to document teacher-classroom behavior.
2. Questionnaire--to provide data on teachers' expectations, perceived classroom behavior, evaluation of Reading Institute content, suggestions for future reading workshops, library usage, as well as use made of funds allocated to each teacher for the purchase of material for use in teaching reading.

Unfortunately, the flurry of end-of-school-year activities, the Team's involvement in the Poor Peoples' Campaign, and the daily changing situation with regard to funding, made it impossible to implement any of the designs described above. The results presented in this report are based on a questionnaire administered to Institute participants at the end of their six-week training session.

Method

It should be noted again that the major purpose of this project was to assist MSD in conducting its own evaluation of this Institute. In order to aid in the development of measuring instruments, an ETS staff member met several times with representatives of the Innovation Team.

Objectives

During the course of these meetings attempts were made to define more precisely just what it was the Institute was designed to accomplish. The ETS representative utilized notes taken during these discussions to develop a tentative set of objectives based on notions expressed by the Innovation Team. These objectives were then sent back to the Team for review. This process was repeated through several iterations and resulted in the set of objectives provided in a later section of this report.

Potential Assessment Techniques

Once statements of Institute objectives were agreed upon, the next step in the evaluation process consisted of identifying and describing the kind of information that might be used in assessing the achievement of each objective. This was also a joint endeavor on the part of the Innovation Team and ETS. (The data to be used in evaluating Reading Institute Objectives are presented in the Results section of this report). It should be noted that this process was undertaken to indicate that it was possible to evaluate, at least in some way, all of the objectives that had been specified. However, it was not meant to indicate that all objectives were going to be assessed (or were assessable at the same level of reliability and validity), or that all methods of assessment were going to be feasible.

Instrument Development

Two measuring instruments were developed jointly by ETS and the Innovation Team. One, the Reading Institute Survey, was designed to assess teachers' perceptions of the Institute in terms of what they had learned and their satisfaction with the conduct of the Institute. In addition, teachers were

asked what change they would make in the conduct of their classes as a result of having attended the Institute. A second instrument, the Classroom Observational Form was designed to supplement the Survey by actually observing certain aspects of teacher classroom behavior.

A third instrument, a short open-ended questionnaire, was developed entirely by the Innovation Team and was designed to assess some of the desired outcomes of sensitivity training. These three instruments are presented in the Appendix section of this report.

Tentative plans were made to collect two or three test items from each consultant scheduled to speak at the Institute. It was felt that this procedure would provide an adequate item pool from which a fourth instrument could be developed. This instrument would assess knowledge of specific reading techniques and the conditions under which their use is most appropriate. However, it became evident quite early in the life of the Institute that this method of instrument development would not be feasible, largely because of the short notice provided the consultants. It is felt that this approach to instrument development could be a useful one in the future, provided consultants were notified well in advance that part of their task would be to construct items related to their lecture material.

Administration of Instruments

Because of the many activities at the end of the school year and outside problems, it was exceedingly difficult to follow even very tentative plans for instrument administration. The Classroom Observational Form was administered in late May. However, it was difficult to determine how teachers were selected, how long they were observed, and the specific directions given observers. Because of these problems, it was decided not to include the Classroom Observation Form in this report about the Institute.

A short open-ended instrument designed by the Innovation Team to assess the effect of sensitivity training was administered during the first week of training and again during the last week. Because initial analysis of these forms yielded little useful data, and the fact that the Reading Institute Survey covered the same objectives, the decision was made to exclude the pre-post questionnaires from this report.

The Reading Institute Survey was administered during the last week of the Institute. In order to create a more relaxed atmosphere the respondents were told not to place their names on the form and to answer the questions as honestly as possible. It should be noted that the presentation of results that follows is based solely on the Reading Institute Survey. This instrument was designed jointly by ETS and the Innovation Team and represents the single instrument for which we had both reasonable experimental controls and useable data. In addition, it was designed to assess a wider variety of Institute objectives than any of the other instruments that were constructed.

RESULTS

Reading Institute Objectives

I. Attitudinal

1. Develop an increased awareness on the part of Institute participants of their own perception of themselves, other people's perception of them, and their effect on other people.
2. Develop an increased awareness on the part of Institute participants of their feelings and attitudes toward the students they teach.
3. Develop an understanding of the effects of teacher attitudes and feelings on the classroom situation.

II. Methodological

1. Develop an increased awareness of the principles of "group dynamics".
2. Develop an understanding of and facility with each of the following:
   a. Language Experience
   b. Linguistic Approach
   c. Individualized Reading
   d. Basal Readers
   e. Combinational
3. Develop an increased understanding of the central constructs underlying all reading instruction.
4. Develop the ability to draw from many approaches, choosing materials appropriate to children's instructional needs.
5. Enable participants to develop a plan for their fall reading program
6. Enable participants to select and acquire new materials for use in teaching reading.
7. Develop facility for dealing with specified types of audio-visual materials and equipment.
8. Improve participants ability to recognize specific student problems which might hamper the learning and teaching of reading in the classroom.
9. Increase the number of strategies used by teachers for the teaching of reading.

III. Teacher Classroom Behavior

1. Increase teacher use of individualized instruction and flexible grouping.
2. Increase the number and use of activity-oriented centers within classrooms.
3. Increase emphasis on teacher as resource person so that students become more self-reliant.
4. Increase student-student interaction and movement.

IV. Continued Professional Development (Follow-up to Summer Institute)

1. Increase the number of times teachers observe others' classrooms.
2. Increase teachers' recognition of own needs and knowledge of sources of aids available to her to meet those needs.
    a. Workshops
    b. Team Members
    c. Other Teachers
    d. Other Professionals in System
    e. Outside Consultants
    f. Professional Materials, e.g., books, articles

Data to be Used in Assessing Objectives

Objectives

*I 1. Develop an increased awareness on the part of Institute participants of their own perception of themselves, other peoples' perception of them, and their effect on other people.

I 2. Develop an increased awareness on the part of Institute participants of their feelings and attitudes toward the students they teach.

I 3. Develop an understanding of the effects of teacher attitudes and feelings on the classroom situation.

II 1. Develop an increased awareness of the principles of "group dynamics."

Objectives I 1, 2, 3, and II 1 will be assessed by:

(A) Several items asking participants what they have learned about themselves, other peoples' perception of them, their effect on other people, and the effect of teacher attitudes and feelings on the classroom situation. These items will be administered on the last day of the Institute.

(B) One or two test situations to be developed by the MSD staff requiring Institute participants to list hypothesis concerning why these events might have occurred. These situations will be administered the first day of the Institute and again on the last day.

Objectives

II 2. Develop an understanding of and facility with each of the following:
    a. Language Experience
    b. Linguistic Approach
    c. Individualized Reading
    d. Basal Readers
    e. Combinational

II 3. Develop an increased understanding of the central constructs underlying all reading instruction.

*Roman numerals refer to the categories of objectives presented on the preceding two pages.

II 4. Develop the ability to draw from many approaches, choosing materials appropriate to children's instructional needs.

II 8. Improve participants' ability to recognize specific student problems which might hamper the learning and teaching of reading in the classroom.

II 9. Increase the number of strategies available to teachers for the teaching of reading.

Objectives II 2, 3, 4, 8, and 9 will be assessed by:

(A) Two or three test situations or "cases" to be developed by consultants. These items will be multiple choice or require the respondent to write in the method of teaching reading he believes is called for and to indicate why. These items will be administered during the last day of the Institute.

(B) Institute participants' description of a situation where a particular method of teaching reading might be appropriate. This will be administered during the last day of the Institute.

Objective

II 5. Enable participants to develop a plan for their fall reading program.

Objective II 5 will be assessed by:

(A) Innovation team members assigned to the Institute. They will record the number of reading plans completed and handed in by the end of the Institute.

Objective

II 6. Enable participants to select and acquire new materials for use in teaching reading.

Objective II 6 will be assessed by:

(A) A member of the Innovation Team assigned to record the purchases made by each participant.

Objective

II 7. Develop facility for dealing with specified types of audio-visual materials and equipment.

Objective II 7 will be assessed by:

(A) Use of a checklist containing the equipment to be provided to participants. This will be developed by the Innovation Team. A record will be kept by the Team of the number of teachers who have demonstrated their ability to use each piece of equipment.

Objective

III 1. Increase teacher use of individualized instruction and flexible grouping.

III 2. Increase the number and use of activity-oriented centers within classrooms.

III 3. Increase emphasis on teacher as resource person so that students become more self-reliant.

III 4. Increase student-student interaction and movement.

Objectives II 1, 2, 3, and 4 will be assessed by:

(A) Items in the classroom observational form. Observations were conducted in May (pretest) and will be conducted again in mid-October (posttest).

Objective

IV 1. Increase the number of times teachers observe others' classrooms.

IV 2. Increase teachers' recognition of own needs and knowledge of sources of aids available to her to meet those needs.

a. Workshops
b. Team Members
c. Other Teachers
d. Other Professionals in System
e. Outside Consultants
f. Professional Materials, e.g., books, articles

Objectives IV 1 and 2 will be assessed by:

(A) A member of the Innovation Team assigned to record the frequency of teacher observations, workshops, etc. These data will be summarized as of 31 October, 1968.

Reading Institute Survey

Completed questionnaires were obtained from 64 of the 69 Institute participants. The number of teachers selecting each response is given, and the mean provided when appropriate. Wherever teachers were asked to give their opinions or explanations, the three or four most frequent responses were provided.

Mean age of teachers: 32.2 years

Mean number of years previously taught: 7.9

Grade level taught last year:

Kindergarten - 4	4th grade - 2
1st grade - 20	5th grade - 1
2nd grade - 17	6th grade - 2
3rd grade - 13	Other - 5 (Members of Innovation Team)

Grade level to be taught this year:

Kindergarten - 5	4th grade - 0
1st grade - 17	5th grade - 0
2nd grade - 21	6th grade - 0
3rd grade - 16	Other - 5 (Members of Innovation Team)

1. What types of class grouping have you used in the past?

Conference - 22	Interest - 38	Total class reading - 39
Social - 21	Homogeneous - 48	Other - Homogeneous - 4
Pal Reading- 31	Special Purpose- 31	Individualized - 2
Permanent - 6	Skill Need - 49	

2. What types of class grouping have you never used before but play to try?

Conference - 22	Interest - 20	Total Class Reading - 10
Social - 16	Homogeneous - 1	Other - Individualized - 4
Pal Reading- 25	Special Purpose- 11	
Permanent - 13	Skill Need - 9	

3. Is there anything you have not usually done in your classroom that you intend to do as a result of this Institute?

YES - 60 NO - 3 OMIT - 1

a. Individualized reading - 36

b. Creative writing and making books with the children - 18

c. Allow children more freedom in the classroom - 4

d. Use a camera as a reading aid - 9

4. Is there anything you have usually done in your classroom that you will no longer do as a result of this institute?

YES - 40 NO - 12 OMIT - 12

a. Will not use permanent reading groups and other structured group activities - 16

b. Will not use the basal reader to the exclusion of everything else - 14

c. Will not disregard individual interests and needs of the children - 8

5. What are some of the best ways to take advantage of the kind of language the child brings to school?

a. Make use of individual accents and identify standard language patterns - 28

b. Write about experiences and make books - 25

c. Tell stories - 22

d. Use language experience charts - 11

6. What information would you include if you were keeping reading records on each child in your class?

a. Title, number, and date of books read - 40

b. Reading weaknesses and skills needed - 40

c. New words and skills learned - 38

d. Child's reading interests - 26

7. Which of the following methods of teaching reading do you think will be most useful to you and why?

a. Language experience -31

Brings out child - 5
Builds vocabulary - 4
Makes use of child's own language - 4

b. Linguistic approach - 7

Makes use of child's own vocabulary- 4

c. Individualized reading -41

Allows each child to progress at his own rate - 13
Allows teacher to meet needs of each child - 7

d. Basal reader -10

e. Eclectic (i.e., combinational) -24

Allows each child to learn from approach best suited to him - 15
Takes the best from each of the other methods - 5

8. In general, I would expect a child's learning of public language to be reflected first in his _____

   speaking - 49

   writing - 3

   reading - 9

   speaking and reading - 1

   speaking, reading, and writing - 2

9. As you think of September, do you think your principal/supervisor will interfere with the innovative approaches you may wish to initiate in your classroom?

   No - 36

   Maybe - 19

   Probably - 7

   Certainly - 0

   Omit - 2

10. How much of what you have learned in the institute do you think will be possible to implement in your school?

    Quite a bit - 44

    A fair amount - 20

11. How many hours per day did you devote to reading and/or phonics and language arts last year?

    One hour - 8

    Two hours - 23 Mean 2.5

    Three hours - 24

    Four hours - 6

    Five hours - 1

    Omit - 2

12. How many hours per day do you intend to devote to reading and/or phonics and language arts during the coming year?

    One hour - 1

    Two hours - 9

    Three hours - 15

    Four hours - 16

    Five hours - 5

    Six hours - 6

    As much as possible - 9

    Omit - 3

    Mean of 52 teachers responding by number 3.6 hours

13. Do you agree with the statement: Individualized Reading Instruction is great, but it is almost impossible to achieve in a class of thirty children?

Strongly agree - 4

Agree somewhat - 22

Disagree somewhat - 21

Strongly disagree - 16

14. Do you agree with the statement: If children are to learn new speech patterns, they must be corrected immediately after making errors?

Strongly agree - 3

Agree somewhat - 8

Disagree somewhat - 13

Strongly disagree - 40

15. Do you agree with the statement: It is more important initially that a child enjoys language than for him to adopt the standard dialect?

Strongly agree - 44

Agree somewhat - 15

Disagree somewhat - 1

Strongly disagree - 3

Questions 16 through 23 were answered from the following scale indicating amount of change. The numbers inside the parentheses indicate the number of respondents selecting each option.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
no real change		a fair amount of change				a great deal of change

16. How much has your use of new materials changed?

1 -(5) 2 -(3) 3 -(10) 4 -(10) 5 -(9) 6 -(23) 7 -(3) Omit-(1) Mean 4.5

17. How has your classroom organization changed?

1 -(3) 2 -(6) 3 -(5) 4 -(10) 5 -(8) 6 -(21) 7 -(10) Omit-(1) Mean 4.9

18. How much have your classroom operations changed?

1 -(4) 2 -(4) 3 -(8) 4 -(11) 5 -(8) 6 -(21) 7 -(7) Omit-(1) Mean 4.7

19. How much has your reading methodology changed?

1 -(2) 2 -(4) 3 -(6) 4 -(8) 5 -(12) 6 -(20) 7 -(11) Omit-(1) Mean 5.0

20. How much have you changed?

1 -(4) 2 -(5) 3 -(9) 4 -(5) 5 -(19) 6 -(18) 7 -(3) Omit-(1) Mean 4.5

21. How much has other people's perception of you changed?

1 -(7) 2 -(10) 3 -(11) 4 -(10) 5 -(15) 6 -(9) 7 -(0) Omit-(2) Mean 3.7

22. How much have your interactions with people changed?

1 -(7) 2 -(8) 3 -(7) 4 -(8) 5 -(19) 6 -(13) 7 -(2) Omit-(0) Mean 4.1

23. How much have your attitudes toward children changed?

1 -(13) 2 -(9) 3 -(6) 4 -(6) 5 -(19) 6 -(6) 7 -(5) Omit-(0) Mean 3.7

Questions 25 through 34 were answered from the following scale indicating the frequency of using certain reading practices. Teachers indicated how often they used each reading practice in the past and how often they planned to use it in the future. Again, the numbers inside the parentheses indicate the number of respondents selecting each response.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Seldom (once a month or less)	Sometimes (once or twice a month)	Often (twice or more a week)	Very often (almost every day)

25. Direct child to read in order to answer specific literal questions (who, what, when?)

Past 1 -(0) 2 -(1) 3 -(9) 4 -(29) 5 -(20) Mean 4.2

Future 1 -(2) 2 -(9) 3 -(19) 4 -(16) 5 -(12) Mean 3.4

26. Direct child to interpret, evoke evaluation, feelings, judgments, anticipation

Past 1 -(1) 2 -(1) 3 -(7) 4 -(31) 5 -(22) Mean 4.2

Future 1 -(2) 2 -(2) 3 -(2) 4 -(9) 5 -(45) Mean 4.6

27. Direct child to deal with word form, such as length, similarities to, or differences from other words.

Past 1 -(2) 2 -(3) 3 -(6) 4 -(23) 5 -(28) Mean 4.2

Future 1 -(2) 2 -(0) 3 -(6) 4 -(18) 5 -(34) Mean 4.4

28. Have child deal with structural units (roots, prefixes, suffixes, spelling patterns).

Past 1 -(6) 2 -(3) 3 -(6) 4 -(24) 5 -(16) Mean 3.8

Future 1 -(4) 2 -(2) 3 -(8) 4 -(21) 5 -(20) Mean 3.9

29. Have child deal with phonic aspects of words in text (sound letter, relationships).

Past 1 -(0) 2 -(1) 3 -(5) 4 -(25) 5 -(30) Omit -(3) Mean 4.4

Future 1 -(0) 2 -(1) 3 -(8) 4 -(19) 5 -(31) Omit -(5) Mean 4.4

30. Direct child to do silent reading

Past 1 -(0) 2 -(1) 3 -(3) 4 -(20) 5 -(36) Omit -(4) Mean 4.5

Future 1 -(1) 2 -(2) 3 -(6) 4 -(12) 5 -(38) Omit -(5) Mean 4.4

31. Direct child to do oral reading

Past 1 -(0) 2 -(1) 3 -(6) 4 -(28) 5 -(26) Omit -(3) Mean 4.3

Future 1 -(1) 2 -(2) 3 -(1) 4 -(25) 5 -(31) Omit -(4) Mean 4.4

32. Direct child to do oral followed by silent reading.

Past 1 -(23) 2 -(9) 3 -(11) 4 -(13) 5 -(3) Omit -(5) Mean 2.4

Future 1 -(16) 2 -(8) 3 -(11) 4 -(7) 5 -(13) Omit -(9) Mean 2.9

33. Direct child to do silent followed by oral reading.

Past 1 -(4) 2 -(4) 3 -(5) 4 -(16) 5 -(28) Omit -(7) Mean 4.1

Future 1 -(5) 2 -(5) 3 -(11) 4 -(12) 5 -(21) Omit -(10) Mean 3.7

34. Direct child to use any of above strategies in other subjects than reading.

Past 1 -(1) 2 -(4) 3 -(15) 4 -(16) 5 -(21) Omit -(7) Mean 3.9

Future 1 -(0) 2 -(0) 3 -(0) 4 -(12) 5 -(41) Omit -(8) Mean 4.7

35. Was the sensitivity training useful and why?

YES - 56 NO - 7 OMIT - 1

Improved group communications, creating a cohesive group - 27

Promoted understanding of other people - 25

Promoted self-understanding - 20

People were not honest - 4

36. What did the sensitivity training accomplish for you?

Promoted self-understanding - 23

Facilitated working and communicating with others - 23

Promoted understanding of others - 17

Instilled self-confidence in oneself - 13

37. What do you think the sensitivity training accomplished for others?

Enhanced group cooperation and eased group communication - 23

Promoted awareness and understanding of self - 17

Promoted understanding of others - 10

Helped people gain confidence in themselves - 8

38. Do you think sensitivity training would be helpful in your school and why?

YES - 51 NO - 9 OMIT - 4

To promote better working conditions - 29

To improve channels of communication - 14

To improve relations with the other students - 7

Teachers would not express themselves openly - 5

39. After this summer's experience, how do you feel about working in a group situation?

    Less comfortable - 1

    About the same - 17

    More comfortable - 46

Questions 40 through 43 were answered from the following scale:

1 = Never 2 = Seldom 3 = Sometimes 4 = Frequently 5 = Very frequently

The numbers inside the parentheses indicate the number of respondents selecting each option.

40. How often did your team leader help you with your projects?

    1 -(2) 2 -(3) 3 -(12) 4 -(17) 5 -(28) Omit -(2) Mean 4.1

41. How often did other members of your group help you with your projects?

    1 -(0) 2 -(3) 3 -(25) 4 -(22) 5 -(13) Omit -(1) Mean 3.7

42. How often did you help the classroom teacher with her projects?

    1 -(0) 2 -(1) 3 -(20) 4 -(26) 5 -(14) Omit -(3) Mean 3.9

43. How often did you help the children with their projects?

    1 -(0) 2 -(0) 3 -(10) 4 -(27) 5 -(27) Omit -(0) Mean 4.3

44. How satisfied were you with the overall aspects of this institute?

1	2	3	4	5
Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied		Satisfied	Very Sattisfied

1 -(0) 2 -(2) 3 -(6) 4 -(36) 5 -(19) Omit -(1) Mean 4.1

45. Was the content of the program relevant to your needs?

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all		Somewhat		Very

1 -(0) 2 -(0) 3 -(23) 4 -(21) 5 -(20) Mean 4.0

46. How much did you learn in the institute?

1	2	3	4	5
Nothing		A fair amount		A great deal

1 -(0) 2 -(3) 3 -(16) 4 -(18) 5 -(27) Mean 4.1

47. How do you feel about your own participation in the workshop?

Not satisfied at all	- 0
Not very satisfied	- 3
Fairly satisfied	- 35
Very satisfied	- 26

48. Compared to the other institute participants, how much did you work?

Quite a bit less than most	- 0
A little bit less than most	- 1
As much as most	- 41
A little more than most	- 14
More than most	- 7
Omit	- 1

49. Compared to previous institutes, how much did participants in this institute work?

This is my first institute	- 29
Quite a bit less than usual	- 0
A little less than usual	- 1
About the same	- 7
A little harder than usual	- 18
Harder than usual	- 8
Omit	- 1

50. A. Based on your experiences this summer, what things did you like the best?

The freedom of flexibility such as learning new methods and participating in informal classrooms	- 29
Consultants	- 22
Working with the children	- 21
The availability of new materials and supplies	- 21
Group work	- 19
Sensitivity training	- 12

B. What things did you like least during the summer?

Lack of organization, including lack of punctuality and the scheduling conflicts that prevented some to hear all of the consultants	- 20
Some of the consultants	- 15
Salary discrepancies and taxes on salaries	- 12
Lack of time to experiment with things learned	- 11
Lack of definition of roles	- 7

C. What things would you add?

Consultants should spend a part of each day with children - 4
Compulsory attendance of principals and supervisors for one week - 3
More workshops in drama and music with the children - 3
Sensitivity at end as well as beginning - 2
Negro consultants - 2

D. What things would you eliminate?

Sensitivity as a requirement - 3
Working in the classroom all day - 3
Some all-group meetings - 2
Group responsibility - 2

51. Do you think the Innovation Team can be of help to you this coming year?
YES - 63 NO - 0 OMIT - 1

If yes, how?
Securing and guiding use of new materials - 45
Advising and giving new ideas for operation of classroom - 42
Setting up workshops - 13
Working with principal and others to furnish support - 6

52. Other comments, suggestions, or reactions

Organize groups according to grade level - 1
Always have same sensitivity group together - 1
Continue to meet throughout the year - 1

DISCUSSION

This section of the report will present some highlights of the results and attempt to interpret and discuss some of their implications.

Reading Practices

In their questionnaire responses, Institute participants indicated they believed that:

1. Individualized reading, language experience, and the eclectic approaches to teaching reading would be most useful to them.
2. It would be possible to individualize reading instruction, even in a class of 30 students.

They also indicated their intentions to:

1. Try ways of grouping that they had not previously used in their reading classes.
2. Discontinue the use of permanent reading groups and the basal reader to the exclusion of other materials.
3. Individualize reading instruction, allow children more freedom in the classroom, and use creative writing more as a vehicle for teaching language skills.
4. Take into account the individual student's reading interests.
5. Increase the amount of class time they devoted to reading and language arts.
6. Attempt to evoke more critical evaluation of reading materials from students.
7. Direct and encourage students to make use of their reading skills in subjects other than formal reading.

It seems apparent that Institute participants have expressed many positive attitudes toward both their students and the teaching of reading. These attitudes, they say, will be reflected in their more varied approaches to grouping children, in allowing children more freedom of movement, and in their recognition of the child as a thinking, feeling individual who has his own set of needs and interests. Their intention to meet student needs is shown in their stated desire to individualize instruction and to utilize an eclectic approach in teaching reading rather than total reliance on any single technique or approach.

In dealing with students, teachers indicated that they would attempt to draw the children out more and encourage them to express their own ideas. The instructors recognize that language is a tool to be used freely and easily--not something to elicit fear and embarassment.

It is interesting to note that although many of the ideas expressed above would require substantial effort on the part of the teachers involved, they believed that quite a bit of what they learned could be implemented. In addition, most were certain they would have no interference from their supervisors in undertaking innovative approaches.

These data about reading practices seem to indicate that part of methodological objectives 2, 3, 4, 8, and 9 and Teacher Classroom Behavior Objectives 1 and 4 have been achieved--at least in terms of what Institute participants <u>say</u> they have learned.

<u>Teacher Participation in Institute</u>

Questionnaire results indicate that Institute participants said:

1. Team leaders frequently helped teachers with their projects.
2. Team members helped each other, helped classroom teachers, and helped children with their projects.
3. In the majority of cases, participants were quite satisfied with their participation in the Institute. In addition, they felt that this Institute had required them to work harder than other institutes they had attended.

In general, it appears that Institute members felt they had played an active role in learning and teaching. Thus, the Institute apparently avoided one of the major criticisms of previous in-service workshops that had tended to use a passive instructional style. In addition, the interaction and cooperation among teachers that took place during the workshop might very well carry over to the regular school year. This could help to break down the notion of teaching behind closed doors that existed previously.

These data tap some of the elements of attitudinal objectives 1, 2, and 3, as well as continued Professional Development Objectives 1 and 2. The results provide some indication that the groundwork for the possible attainment of these objectives has been laid.

Sensitivity Training

The data indicated that most participants:

1. Thought sensitivity training was very useful. Many thought it helped create a cohesive group and promoted understanding of self and others.
2. Had changed quite a bit and could interact better with other people. Almost everyone said he felt more comfortable in a group situation.
3. Thought sensitivity training would be helpful in their home schools because it would promote better working conditions and interpersonal relations.

It seems that almost all of the participants thought the sensitivity training was useful and that they had gained a great deal from it. There was a strong feeling that this phase of the Institute had helped make the group activities that followed run more smoothly and efficiently. It is worth noting the relative intensity of the statements concerning sensitivity training. The great majority of responses were very favorable.

Statements and responses derived from the questionnaire indicate that some aspects of attitudinal objectives 1, 2, and 3, as well as methodological objective 1 have been achieved. Again, it should be noted that an estimate of the achievement of an objective or parts of it are based solely on what Institute participants say they have learned.

The Innovation Team

Data derived from the questionnaire yielded the following information:

1. All Institute participants said they believed that the Innovation Team could be helpful to them during the coming year.
2. The most frequently mentioned ways in which teachers thought the Innovation Team could help were:
    a. Securing for them and guiding them in the use of new materials.
    b. Providing advice and new ideas for classroom activities
    c. Setting up workshops

These data seem to indicate that the Innovation Team has done an excellent job of gaining both the acceptance and respect of Institute participants. They are viewed as the people to see for curriculum assistance. Interestingly enough,

approximately 10 percent of the comments also mentioned the Team as a possible liaison with the school administration. It appears that the Team seems to have bridged the gap, at least in the eyes of Institute participants, between teachers and school administration. It appears, then, that the Institute seems to have at least partially achieved objective 2 in Continued Professional Development.

General Participant Reactions to the Institute

Analyses of the questionnaire indicated that workshop participants:

1. Were generally quite satisfied with the Institute. Only two were dissatisfied with it.
2. Agreed that the content of the workshop was relevant to their needs. Not one respondent felt the content was irrelevant.
3. Agreed that they learned "a fair amount or more".
4. Liked the following aspects of the Institute best:
   a. freedom and flexibility in learning new methods
   b. consultants
   c. working with children
   d. availability of new materials and supplies
   e. group work
   f. sensitivity training
5. Liked the following aspects of the Institute least:
   a. lack of organization (punctuality, inability to see and hear all the consultants)
   b. some of the consultants
   c. taxes on salaries
   d. lack of time to experiment with things learned
   e. lack of definition of roles

Most participants appear to have been quite satisfied with the Institute. They felt the content was relevant and enjoyed the freedom of action and resources available to them.

The major criticisms or shortcomings of the Institute dealt with the use of consultants. Some participants complained about not being able to see all the consultants because of scheduling problems, while others indicated that some consultants were inappropriate, not well prepared, or just not very interesting.

Improving the Institute

The general comments item yielded many recommendations for improving the Institute. There was, however, very little agreement among teachers about just how to accomplish this. The following suggestions, although mentioned by only a few teachers, appear to be quite relevant and might be considered when planning future in-service workshops.

1. Whenever possible, teachers should be able to work with children in the same grade in which they will be teaching the following year.
2. The compulsory attendance of principals and supervisors for the sensitivity training part of the Institute might improve working conditions and interpersonal relations during the school year.
3. Consultants should be asked to spend a part of each day with the children to demonstrate methods and aid the teachers.

Comments About the Evaluation

It should be recognized that it was not possible to evaluate all Institute objectives, nor to evaluate many of them as thoroughly as had been planned. This was due, in large part, to the uncertain funding situation that prevailed until the opening of the Institute. This evaluation was conducted in a "real world" setting with many outside stimuli impinging upon it (the Innovation Team's outside commitments, Poor People's Campaign, etc.). Compromises had to be made--things were done with inadequate controls--because otherwise they would not have been done at all. There is no doubt that this evaluation could have been conducted more scientifically and precisely. However, if one were to have depended on the conditions necessary for such an evaluation, this study would not have been conducted. Indeed, in view of the circumstances, it was remarkable that an Institute was conducted at all--particularly one in which the teachers involved expressed such favorable responses about what they had learned. The Innovation Team deserves a good deal of credit for successfully organizing and conducting this Institute under the very trying conditions that existed.

It is felt that the experience gained by the Team in specifying objectives, the data to be collected to assess them, and in the development of measuring instruments should be quite useful in the planning and conduct of future program evaluations. All things considered, the evaluation was worth doing and the Institute, based on the data contained in this report, appears to have been successful.

Recommendations

Two general recommendations are made below. The first deals with the planning of future in-service programs. The other deals with the continued follow-up of Institute participants and their classes.

Although it is recognized that funding is frequently a difficult problem and one that is often not under the control of program planners, it is recommended that every effort be made to satisfy funding requirements as early as possible. A known situation would allow for more realistic program planning. More time would then be available for selecting consultants and specifying their role in both the conduct of the program and its evaluation.

It is also suggested that attention be given to following up Institute participants. This could take the form of a brief questionnaire or interview. Its purpose would be to determine: 1) how useful the Institute content has been to them, 2) their present problems involving reading, and 3) their suggestions for continued training. In addition, existing testing programs assessing the reading performance of participants' classes could be used as another source of evaluation data. A comparison of the mean student reading scores in the classes of Institute trained teachers with the means of classes of non-Institute trained teachers would be interesting and would provide tentative evaluation data. The mean class scores of Institute trained teachers could also be compared with the mean scores of their last year's classes where appropriate. This might provide some indication of whether the knowledge and skills acquired during the Institute benefited the participants' classes in terms of test performance. Continued follow-up of Institute trained teachers and their students even beyond the next year is desirable.

CONCLUSIONS

Questionnaire data indicated that the large majority of Institute participants said they:

1. learned "quite a bit" about reading methodology
2. found the content of the Institute relevant to their needs
3. intend to implement what they had learned
4. generally liked the way the Institute was conducted
5. view the Innovation Team as a resource for new materials, techniques, and curriculum development

In general, these responses indicate that the Institute has achieved many of its objectives--at least in terms of the things participants <u>say</u> they have learned and will do as a result of this knowledge. Again, it should be noted that the results of this evaluation were based on an anonymous questionnaire which should have reduced, at least to some extent, any perceived obligation on the part of the respondents to appear more favorably disposed toward the Institute than was truly the case. Almost all of the participants were quite pleased with the Institute.

APPENDIX A

Reading Institute Survey

Reading Institute Survey

The purpose of this survey is to determine how valuable the institute was to you and how future institutes might be improved. Please answer the questions as candidly as possible. All responses will be kept confidential.

Your age _____

Number of years you have taught _____

Grade level taught last year _____

Grade level you will teach in September _____

Part I

The following items are concerned with classroom activities. Each group of items has its own set of directions. READ THE DIRECTIONS CAREFULLY.

1 - 2 Circle the numbers that correspond with...

1. ...the types of class grouping that you have used in the past:

1. conference	5. interest	9. total class reading
2. social	6. homogeneous	10. other (specify)
3. pal reading	7. special purpose	_____
4. permanent	8. skill need	_____

2. ...the types of class grouping that you have never used before, but plan to try:

1. conference	5. interest	9. total class reading
2. social	6. homogeneous	10. other (specify)
3. pal reading	7. special purpose	_____
4. permanent	8. skill need	_____

3. Is there anything you have not usually done in your classroom that you intend to do as a result of this institute? YES NO (Circle one) Please explain

a.

b.

c.

4. Is there anything you have usually done in your classroom that you will no longer do as a result of this institute? YES NO (Circle one) Please explain

a.

b.

c.

5. List some of the best ways to take advantage of the kind of language the child brings to school.

   a.

   b.

   c.

6. List information you would include if you were keeping reading records on each child in your class.

   a.

   b.

   c.

   d.

   e.

7-10 Circle the number of the alternative which you feel best answers each question or completes each statement.

7. Which of the following methods of teaching reading do you think will be most useful to you?

   1. language experience

   2. linguistic approach

   3. individualized reading

   4. basal reader

   5. eclectic (i.e. combinational)

   Give specific reason(s) for your choice.

   a.

   b.

   c.

8. In general, I would expect a child's learning of public language to be reflected first in his _____.

(Responses on next page.)

1. speaking
2. writing
3. reading

9. As you think of September, do you think your principal/supervisor will interfere with the innovative approaches you may wish to initiate in your classroom?

   1. no
   2. maybe
   3. probably
   4. certainly

10. How much of what you have learned in the institute do you think will be possible to implement in your school?

    1. almost nothing
    2. very little
    3. a fair amount
    4. quite a bit

11. How much time did you devote to reading and/or phonics and language arts last year?

    Number hours per day _____

12. How much time do you intend to devote to reading and/or phonics and language arts during the coming year?

    Number hours per day _____

1	2	3	4
strongly disagree	disagree somewhat	agree somewhat	strongly agree

13-15 Using the scale above, write the number which best describes how you feel about the following statements. Place the number in the box to the right of each statement.

13. Individualized Reading Instruction is great, but it is almost impossible to achieve in a class of 30 children. ☐

14. If children are to learn new speech patterns, they much be corrected immediately after making errors. ☐

15. It is more important initially that a child enjoys language than for him to adopt the standard dialect. ☐

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
no real change		a fair amount of change			a great deal	

Below are a list of topics that have been included in this summer's institute. In the box to the right of each topic, write the number from the above scale that best describes how you feel you have changed in each area.

16. Use of new materials ☐
17. Classroom organization ☐
18. Classroom operations ☐
19. Reading methodology ☐
20. Myself ☐
21. Other people's perception of me ☐
22. My interactions with people ☐
23. Attitudes toward children ☐
24. Other--please specify _____ ☐

_____

_____

1	2	3	4	5
never	seldom (once a month or less)	sometimes (once or twice a month)	Often (twice or more a week)	very often (almost every day)

25-34 The following statements describe some practices in the teaching of reading. Using the above scale, rate each statement twice. The first will indicate the frequency of your reading practice in the past. The second will indicate how you plan to operate in the future. Circle the appropriate numbers.

		Before	After
25.	Direct child to read in order to answer specific literal questions (who, what, when?).	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
26.	Direct child to interpret, evoke evaluation, feelings, judgments, anticipation.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
27.	Direct child to deal with word form, such as length, similarities to, or differences from other words.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
28.	Have child deal with structural units (roots, prefixes, suffixes, spelling patterns).	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
29.	Have child deal with phonic aspects of words in text (sound letter, relationships).	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
30.	Direct child to do silent reading.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
31.	Direct child to do oral reading.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
32.	Direct child to do oral followed by silent reading.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
33.	Direct child to do silent followed by oral reading.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
34.	Direct child to use any of above strategies in other subjects than reading.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Part II

The following items deal with things that happened during the institute. Please respond thoughtfully.

35. Was the sensitivity training useful? YES NO (circle one) Give reasons.

a.

b.

c.

36. List things you think the sensitivity training accomplished for you.

a.

b.

c.

37. List things you think the sensitivity training accomplished for others.

a.

b.

c.

38. Do you think sensitivity training would be helpful in your school? YES NO (circle one) Give reasons for your response.

a.

b.

c.

39. After this summer's experience, how do you feel about working in a group situation. Circle the letter of the statement which best describes your feeling.

a. less comfortable

b. about the same

c. more comfortable

1	2	3	4	5
never	seldom	sometimes	frequently	very frequently

40-43 Using the scale above, write the number in the box to the right of each statement indicating how often...

40. Your team leader helped you with your projects. ☐

41. Other members of your group helped you with your projects. ☐

42. You helped the classroom teacher with her projects. ☐

43. You helped the children with their projects. ☐

Part III

The following items are designed to obtain your general reactions to the institute.

44-46 Circle the number on each scale which corresponds to your feeling.

44. How satisfied were you with the overall aspects of this institute?

1	2	3	4	5
very dissatisfied		dissatisfied	satisfied	very satisfied

45. Was the content of the program relevant to your needs?

1	2	3	4	5
not at all		somewhat		very

46. How much did you learn in the institute?

1	2	3	4	5
nothing		a fair amount		a great deal

47-49 Circle the number of the appropriate response.

47. How do you feel about your own participation in the workshop?

1. not satisfied at all

2. not very satisfied

3. fairly satisfied

4. very satisfied

48. Compared to the other institute participants, I generally worked

1. quite a bit less than most participants.

2. a little bit less than most.

3. as much as most.

4. a little more than most.

5. more than most.

49. Compared to previous institutes, participants in this institute worked:

0. This is my first institute.

1. quite a bit less than usual.

2. a little less than usual.

3. about the same.

4. a little harder than usual.

5. harder than usual.

50. Based on your experiences this summer, please make specific comments on the following:

A. The three things you liked best.

a.

b.

c.

B. The three things you liked least.

a.

b.

c.

C. The three things you would add.

a.

b.

c.

D. The three things you would eliminate.

a.

b.

c.

51. Do you think the Innovation Team can be of help to you this coming year? (Circle one) YES NO

If yes, list ways in which the Innovation Team might help.

a.

b.

c.

52. Please use this space for comments, suggestions, and reactions about the Innovation Team's operation, the institute staff, the coming year, this questionnaire or anything else to which you would like to react.

A P P E N D I X B

Classroom Observational Form

CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONAL FORM

Teachers Name:

Grade:

Student Activities

List % of students involved in each activity:

1. Silent reading _____
2. Oral reading _____
3. Writing _____
4. Listening to:
   (a) radio _____
   (b) tape recorder _____
   (c) teacher _____
   (d) fellow student _____

Student Oral Behavior and Physical Movement

List % of students involved in each activity:

1. No talking _____
2. Quiet orderly talking while working _____
3. Student(s) asking teacher questions _____
4. Student(s) answering teacher questions _____
5. Confusion and loud misbehavior _____
6. Students seated _____
7. Several students moving around room _____
8. Many students moving around room _____

Student Organization

A. List percentage of students organized as follows:

1. Seated listening to teacher _____
2. Participating in main activity in identical ways _____
3. Participating in main activity in different ways _____
4. Participating in group activities _____
5. Participating in individual activities _____

B. How many distinct groups were there: _____

Teacher Interaction with Pupils

Check as many as apply

_____ 1. Teacher interacting with class as a whole

_____ 2. Teacher interacting with single pupil--other pupils functioning as class

_____ 3. Teacher interacting with one pupil while others engage in seatwork

_____ 4. Teacher interacts with group--others function as individuals

_____ 5. Teacher interacting with 1 pupil, others working in groups

_____ 6. Teacher interacting with 1 pupil, others working as individuals

_____ 7. Teacher interacting with group--others function as groups

_____ 8. Teacher not interacting while all pupils engage in seatwork

_____ 9. Teacher not interacting, pupils functioning as groups

Teacher Space and Movement

Check as many as apply

_____ 1. Standing at front of whole class

_____ 2. Sitting at desk, in front of whole class

_____ 3. Writing on chalkboard

_____ 4. Conferring with single student at student's desk

_____ 5. Conferring with student at teacher's desk

_____ 6. Conferring with group at group's station

_____ 7. Walking about room offering help as needed

Observable Equipment, Arrangement, Materials in Classroom

	Check if present
Room Arrangement	
Desks in rows	_____
Desks in groups	_____
Existence of interest centers	
1. Library shelf	_____
2. Listening center	_____
Observable Equipment	
Phonograph	_____
Records	_____
Tape recorder	_____
Film strip projector	_____
Radio	_____
Cameras	_____
Plants	_____
Animals, fish	_____
Materials	
Library-shelf	_____
Library-table to sit at	_____
Reading Programs	
SRA	_____
MacMillian	_____
Peabody	_____
Language Experience	_____
Sounds of language	_____
Literature based	_____
Individual-Learning to think	_____

Bulletin Boards

Teacher made _____

Child made _____

Stories written by children _____

Current newspaper or magazine clippings _____

Poetry written by children _____

Reports written by children _____

Drawings, paintins by students _____

References

Magazines _____

Weekly Reader _____

Encyclopedia _____

Phonic Materials

Phono-visual charts _____

Other commercial charts _____

Group experience chart _____

Work chart (to be completed by students) _____

A P P E N D I X C

Pre-Post Questionnaire

Number:_____

Pre-Post Questionnaire

1a. Child comes crying into the room after the morning bell. Why is he crying? (List the reasons)

1b. What would you do?

2. You are a third grade teacher. In the hall you were passing a group of three third grade teachers. You said: "Good morning". They did not answer. Why?

3. What does the teacher do in the classroom?

4a. In three words describe yourself

4b. In three words describe how others see you